

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/619,573	07/14/2003	Yevgeniy Kuklin	003-16 7098		
7590 06/07/2005			EXAMINER		
James E. Brunton, Esquire			SHAY, DAVID M		
Post Office Box 29000 Glendale, CA 91209-9000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Olondale, Oli	)120) )000		3739		

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary				KUKLIN ET AL.				
		10/619,5 Examine		Art Unit				
				3739				
	The MAILING DATE of this commu	david sha	<u> </u>					
Period fo		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		•				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this com period for reply specified above is less than thirty ( period for reply is specified above, the maximum source to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no exmunication. 30) days, a reply within the statatutory period will apply and wywill, by statute, cause the app	vent, however, may a reply be tin tutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from plication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status				·				
1)[🛛	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on						
•	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	are withdrawn from co						
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the transfer of the drawing(s) filed on is/are applicant may not request that any objected that application is objected to the oath or declaration is objected to the specific or declaration is objected to be the specifi	e: a) accepted or be ection to the drawing(s) g the correction is requi	be held in abeyance. Se red if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internations  See the attached detailed Office actions	or documents have been of documents have been of the priority documental Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applicat ents have been receive lle 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
2) Notice 3) Information	et(s) See of References Cited (PTO-892) See of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( See of Draftsperson's Patement(s) (PTO-1449 of the No(s)/Mail Date Arguet 19,2003		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/619,573 Page 2

Art Unit: 3739

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5, 8, 9, 11-13, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5, 8 and 9 are indefinite because claim 1 and 6 recite the steps of directing first and second portions of pulses "for a duration of time sufficient to....", however, claims 5, 8, and 9, go on to specify the amount of time, the steps in claims 1 and 6 are in the form of "step plus function"; and as such precludes the recitation of sufficient structure, material, or acts for achieving the specified function, the steps reciting particular times being sufficient acts to achieve the function. Thus it is unclear whether the claim is intended to recite step plus function, or the particular times sufficient to perform the function (see MPEP 2181). It is further noted that claim 11 recites, "said second, rotatable high reflectivity mirror" lacks positive antecedent basis. Claims 12 and 13 are indefinite because the preambles thereof recite "The apparatus as defined in claim 10", however, claim 10 is a method claim. For the purposes of examination, claims 12 and 13 will be treated as though they depend from claim 11.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this

subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Tankovich et al.

See figures 1-6a and 8; column 1, line 9 to column 4, line 67 and column 5, line 50 to column 6, line 58.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tankovich et al. Tankovich et al teaches a device as claimed except for the use of a shutter and three mirrors. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ a shutter and a provide two mirrors in place of the single mirror in Figure 8, for example, since this would allow the use of either a mixed pulse and the use of a shutter to spoil the undesired lasing mode, and the use of a single wavelength pulse without having to change the cavity configuration, and since shutters are well known for interrupting lasing, official notice of which is hereby taken, thus producing a device such as claimed.

Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tankovich et al in combination with Reed. Tankovich et al teaches a device as claimed except for the use of a shutter and a plurality of prisms. Reed teaches the use of multiple prisms and a Q-switch,

Page 4

which functions as a shutter. It would have been obvious to the artisan of ordinary skill to employ the prisms of Reed in the device of Tankovich et al, since Tankovich et al recognize that pulses widths need to be controlled, and this configuration can be used to control the laser pulses, as taught by Reed, thus producing a method such as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to david shay whose telephone number is 571-272-4773. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 a.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak, can be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).